

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 are currently pending in the application, Claim 1 is amended by the present amendment; and new Claim 25 is added by the present amendment. Claims 8-24 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 25 recites substantially the same subject matter as amended Claim 1, but has been written to invoke interpretation under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph. Support for amended Claim 1 can be found in the original specification, claims and drawings.¹ No new matter is presented.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Aotake (U.S. Patent 6,411,771, hereinafter "Aotake").

Briefly recapitulating, one embodiment of the present invention relates to a method for recording video signals on a personal computer and storing them in a manner such that their contents can be easily verified. A personal computer is configured to accept signals from an antenna, VCR, or a digital video cassette recorder (DVCR) or from a DVCR equipped with an image pickup function, or any other potential signal source. The personal computer then records and/or reproduces the images and voice represented by the received analog or digital signal.

More specifically, amended Claim 1 relates to an information processing apparatus with a recording unit configured to record a first supplied picture and a reproducing unit configured to reproduce a second recorded picture. A display controlling unit is configured to provide display control so as to allow the display of a first user interface when the recording unit records the first picture supplied and to display a second user interface when the reproducing unit reproduces the second picture recorded. Further, the first and second

¹ Specification at Figures 9-10.

user interfaces share a recording button through which a user can input orders for operating the recording unit in a playback button through which a user can input orders for operating the reproducing unit.

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing apparatus, comprising:

...wherein said first and second user interface share a recording button through which two input orders for operating said recording unit and a playback button through which to input orders for operating said reproducing unit.

The outstanding Office Action asserts that Aotake teaches all the elements of Claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Aotake describes a picture processing apparatus which uses screen change parameters representing a high degree of screen change to capture still images representative of various points in a recorded image. Figure 8 of Aotake depicts a user interface which is displayed in order to record a supplied picture, and Figure 15 depicts the user interface displayed when a moving video image file is reproduced. It should be noted that the reproduction user interface, and the recording user interface described by Aotake fail to share any operational user inputs, or buttons.

Claim 1 recites that the first and second user interfaces share a recording button through which two input orders for operating the recording unit and a playback button through which to input orders for operating the reproducing unit. One embodiment of this feature is depicted in Figures 9 and 10 of the present specification. In contrast, Aotake describes that no buttons, or user selections, are shared between the recording interface and the reproduction user interface depicted in Figures 8 and 15. These interfaces appear to be completely independent of one another and fail to share any button, user inputs, or other interface features. Therefore, Aotake fails to teach or disclose that a first interface used for


recording and a second interface used for reproduction share a recording button through which to input orders for operating said recording unit and a playback button through which to input orders for operating said reproducing unit, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn. For substantially the same reasons as given with respect to amended Claim 1, it is also submitted that Claims 5 and 7 as amended, also patentably define over Aotake.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-7 is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)